

For the Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART RICOH'S EX
PARTE MOTION TO EXPEDITE**

(Docket No. 411 in C-03-2289; Docket No. 548 in C-03-4669)

For the Northern District of California
13 RICOH CO., LTD.,
14 Plaintiff,
15 v.
16 AEROFLEX, et al.,
17 Defendants.
18

21 Ricoh has filed a motion for a protective order, which it asks be heard on an expedited basis.
22 The Court hereby GRANTS in part and DENIES in part the motion to expedite.

23 The motion to expedite is denied to the extent that it asks for a hearing on August 18, 2006.
24 Ricoh did not file the motion to expedite and motion for a protective order until after 5:00 p.m. on
25 August 17, 2006. Therefore, a hearing on August 18, 2006, would not give Synopsys and the
26 Customer Defendants (“Defendants”) an adequate amount of time to respond, either to the motion to
27 expedite or to the motion for a protective order. The motion to expedite, however, is granted in part
28 because the three subpoenas at issue have a return date of August 18, 2006, so that there is need to

1 have the motion for a protective order heard on a more timely basis than the regular 35-day-notice
2 schedule.

3 Accordingly, the Court hereby stays enforcement of the subpoenas for 7 days and orders
4 Defendants to file an opposition to the motion for a protective order by August 22, 2006, at 5:00
5 p.m. Unless the Court orders otherwise, there shall be no hearing on the motion and the Court shall
6 rule based on the papers only.

7

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9
10 Dated: August 18, 2006



11 EDWARD M. CHEN
12 United States Magistrate Judge

13 For the Northern District of California
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28